REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-36, 38-50, and 52-59 are presently pending, of which claims 1, 30, 44, and 59 are independent. In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-10, 12-36, and 52-59 were rejected. Applicants amend claims 1, 30, 44, and 59 herein. The claim amendments clarify the claim term "configuration" and further rearrange the claims for readability.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in view of the comments set forth below.

I.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

In the Office Action at page 3, first paragraph, claims 1, 3-6, 25, 28, 56, and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0001896 to Johnson (hereafter "Johnson"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

A.   Claims 1, 3-6, 25, 28, and 56

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson fails to disclose at least the following features of claim 1:

> instructions for providing a first interactive hardware object, where the first interactive hardware object:
>> is accessible to the computer,
>> is depicted in the graphical interface, and
>> interacts with the hardware device;
>> ***instructions for providing a first configuration represented by the first interactive hardware object, where the first configuration represents a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties***;
>> instructions for providing a second interactive hardware object , where the second interactive hardware object:
>> is accessible to the computer,
>> is depicted in the graphical interface, and
>> interacts with the hardware device;
>> ***instructions for providing a second configuration represented by the second interactive hardware object, where the second configuration represents the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration***;
>> … and

instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of at most one hardware object.

In some exemplary embodiments (see, e.g., the Specification at pages 5-6), the present application allows a user to specify multiple potential configurations for a hardware device, and then select one configuration from among the different configurations to be used to communicate with the hardware device in a particular instance.

In the Office Action, the Examiner notes that "the broadest reasonable interpretation of 'configuration' in light of the specification can be <u>any</u> property setting for the device" (Office Action at page 31). The Examiner argues that, given the recited claim language, a configuration can be "a single property of a hardware object." Accordingly, the Examiner rejects the claims in view of Johnson. Although Johnson does not allow a user to set a plurality of different configurations, Johnson does allow a user to change multiple "properties" of a single configuration; thus, the Examiner argues that "when a user selects any single setting in Johnson such as, for example, a custom scaling setting, the processor is 'receiving, from a user, a selection of at most one configuration from the plurality of configurations,' as recited in the claim."

The Examiner argues that the claim term "configuration" is broad enough to read on a single property within a configuration; thus, when Johnson provides a plurality of configurable settings, Johnson provides a plurality of "configurations" which may be selected and changed. In order to expedite prosecution, Applicants amend claim 1 to clarify that a configuration represents *a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*. Furthermore, the claims recite first and second configurations (represented by first and second hardware objects), where *the second configuration represents <u>the same collection of properties</u> as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, <u>wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration</u>*.

For example, the first configuration represented by the first hardware object may include Property 1 having Value A, Property 2 having Value B, and Property 3 having Value C. The second configuration represented by the second hardware object would have the same collection

of <u>properties</u> as the first configuration (i.e., Property 1, Property 2, and Property 3), but at least one different <u>value</u> for one of the properties (e.g., Property 1 having Value A, Property 2 having Value B, and Property 3 having Value D).

Thus, two different configurations (such as the first and second configurations recited in amended claim 1) represent the <u>same</u> collection of properties, but at least one value for the properties differs between the two different configurations. This amendment clarifies that a configuration is not a single property having a single setting, or two <u>different</u> subsets of properties with different settings.

Johnson provides only <u>one</u> configuration for a hardware device, as the term "configuration" is described in the claims. In the examples cited by the Examiner, different values may be provided for <u>different</u> properties. For instance, in the Examiner's interpretation, Johnson may have Property 1 having Value A (which the Examiner interprets as one configuration) and Property 2 having Value B (which the Examiner interprets as a second configuration). However, because the "configurations" each represent a <u>different property</u> of the device, it cannot be said that the first and second configurations represent <u>the same collection of properties</u>. Indeed, there is nothing in Johnson that suggests that two different configurations may be provided for the hardware device.

Furthermore, Johnson does not allow a user to select <u>between</u> two different configurations (as the term "configuration" is currently described in the claims), where one configuration differs from the other in that the same properties are present in each configuration, but different values are provided for the properties.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that this amendment addresses the Examiner's concerns regarding the Johnson reference. For at least the reasons identified above, Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 depend from independent claim 1 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 are allowable for at least the

reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

B.   Claim 59

Independent claim 59 recites, among other things:

> instructions for providing a first hardware object, where the first hardware object:
> > is accessible to the computer,
> > is depicted in the graphical interface, and
> > interacts with the hardware device;
>
> ***instructions for providing a first configuration of the hardware device represented by the first hardware object, the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties***;
> > instructions for providing a second hardware object, where the second hardware object:
> > is accessible to the computer,
> > is depicted in the graphical interface, and
> > interacts with the hardware device;
>
> ***instructions for providing a second configuration of the hardware device represented by the second hardware object, the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration***;
> … and
> ***instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of at most one hardware object.***

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson does not disclose at least the above-quoted features of claim 59. As noted above in relation to claim 1, because Johnson shows only <u>one</u> configuration representing a collection of properties, where first and second configurations differ in that they provide differing values for the same property, Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 59.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

II.   Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7-10, 12-24, 26-27, 29, 34-35, 38-43, 48-49, and 52-55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

A.   Claims 7, 8 and 12-14

Claims 7, 8, and 12-14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0035008 to Fuller et al. (hereafter "Fuller"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7, 8 and 12-14 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. As previously discussed in connection with claim 1, Johnson does not disclose or suggest *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*.

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest the above-quoted features of claim 1. Fuller discusses a system and method for querying message-based instruments automatically and/or graphically parsing the responses, and generating code that encapsulates the connection/communication with the instrument and the parsing of the response (Fuller at paragraph [0019]). Fuller does not provide multiple configurations, as recited in claim 1, but rather allows the user to enter only one configuration at a time. Hence, no selection is made from among a plurality of hardware objects, each object representing a different configuration. For example, Fuller at [0024] describes how "code may also be generated to call and execute the saved configuration." This step allows a user to recall a single configuration for a device, and does not display more than one configuration simultaneously, which is present in claim 1.

Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 7, 8 and 12-14.

B.   Claims 9 and 10

Claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0001896 to Hsiung et al. (hereafter "Hsiung"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. As noted above, Johnson does not disclose or suggest *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*, which is present in claim 1.

Hsiung also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Hsiung discusses a technique for processing information or data over a network of computers.

Hsiung further discusses a system for monitoring and controlling a process, or both monitoring and controlling a process, [0007]. The system illustrated in Hsiung includes an input module for receiving a plurality of parameters from a process for manufacture of a substance or object. Hsiung is silent as to receiving <u>any</u> configurations, and hence does not disclose or suggest *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*.

Thus Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 9 and 10.

C.   **Claim 15**

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of Fuller and Hsiung. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 15 depends from claim 1 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*, which is present in claim 1.

As discussed above in II.A and II. B., Fuller and Hsiung each do not disclose or suggest this feature. Thus Fuller, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 15.

D.   Claims 16-17 and 27

Claims 16-17 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0004670 to Schmit et al. (hereafter "Schmit"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Schmit discusses one or more measurement devices comprising a measurement hardware device, a virtual measurement device or other type of device. (Schmit at [0013]). Schmit further indicates that a graphical user interface presents a list of available devices and corresponding channels appropriate for the indicated measurement type, where each of the channels corresponds to a terminal of a corresponding device. (Schmit at [0016]). Schmit further indicates that if the selected measurement type were voltage, the devices listed may be those devices available to the system which are suitable for measuring a voltage. (Schmit at [0136]).

Claims 16, 17 and 27 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *the first configuration representing a*

collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration,* which is present in claim 1.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Schmit does not allow for a plurality of configurations of a hardware device, each configuration represented by a hardware object, and hence does not allow a user to select at most one configuration from among a plurality of configurations. (Schmit at [0013]). On the contrary, Schmit states "the purpose [of the configuration tool architecture] is to present the user with the ability to configure <u>exactly what their application does</u> … and then build a **single** <u>task that encompasses all of this information</u>." (Schmit at [0240]). Schmit allows a user to specify a <u>single</u> configuration, and is not concerned with specifying a <u>plurality</u> of configurations, nor selecting a single configuration from <u>among</u> the plurality of configurations. Accordingly, Schmit does not disclose *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*.

Thus Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 16, 17 and 27.

E.   Claims 18-24 and 26

Claims 18-24 and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of Hsiung, and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0056018 to Pike et al. (hereafter "Pike").

Claims 18-24 and 26 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson and Hsiung do not disclose or suggest *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration,* which are present in claim 1.

Pike also does not disclose or suggest this feature. In particular, Pike does not disclose or suggest *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*.

Pike discusses receiving a first creation command from a user interface and establishing a communication channel linking the command interpreter and the control instrument independent of the interface bus or interface hardware driver type. (Pike at [0004]). Pike indicates a GUI that displays information regarding the configuration of the various communication channels the user may establish in response to user commands. (Pike at [0036]).

In contrast to claim 1, Pike states "the GUI 14 displays information regarding **the** configuration of the various communication channels the user 30 may establish in response to user commands" (Pike at [0036]). This indicates that Pike displays a single configuration for each hardware or software device, and not multiple configurations, which are present in claim 1. Accordingly, Pike does not allow a user to make *a selection of at most one hardware object*, each hardware object representing a different configuration, which is present in claim 1.

Thus Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 18-24 and 26.

F.   Claim 29

Claim 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,986,653 to Phathayakorn et al. (hereafter "Phathayakorn"). Claim 29 depends from claim 1 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*, which is present in claim 1.

Phathayakorn discusses a method for signaling and acknowledging events associated with resource object organized in a foldable object tree displayed by a GUI. Phathayakorn further indicates that a foldable object tree allows a part of the tree to be folded into its parent object, (Col. 1, lines 55-60).

Phathayakorn also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Phathayakorn describes displaying data relating to signaling and acknowledging events associated with a resource object. (Phathayakorn at col. 1 lns. 55-60). Phathayakorn is concerned with the objects as they actually exist, not potential configurations that a user might want to select. Therefore, Phathayakorn does not disclose *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*, where each hardware object represents a configuration

Thus Phathayakorn and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller, Hsiung and Phathayakorn in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 29.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 7-10, 12-24, 26-27, 29, 34-35, 38-43, 48-49, and 52-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

G.   Claims 30-33, 36, 42-43, and 57

Claims 30-33, 36, 42-43, and 57 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,491 to Gray (hereafter "Gray"). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 30 recites, among other things:

> providing a first hardware object, where the first hardware object:
>> is accessible to the computer,
>> is depicted in the graphical interface, and
>> interacts with the hardware device;
>
> *providing a first configuration of the hardware device represented by the first hardware object, the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*;
>> providing a second hardware object, where the second hardware object:
>> is accessible to the computer,
>> is depicted in the graphical interface, and
>> interacts with the hardware device;
>
> *providing a second configuration of the hardware device represented by the second hardware object, the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*;

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson and Gray, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose at least *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*, which are present in claim 30.

As noted above with respect to claim 1, Johnson does not disclose or suggest providing a first and second configuration represented by hardware objects, ***the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*** and ***the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration***. The addition of Gray fails to cure the factual deficiencies of Johnson with respect to this feature of claim 30.

Gray is generally directed to a vehicle control computer system. While Gray discusses a device interface for a hardware device, Gray does not allow for multiple configurations of a device, each configuration represented by a hardware object. Indeed, Gray is silent with respect to the above-quoted features of claim 30.

For at least the reasons stated above, Johnson and Gray, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 31-33, 36, 42-43, and 57 depend from independent claim 30 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 30. Accordingly claims 31-33, 36, 42-43, 57 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 30.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 31-33, 36, 42-43, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

H.   Claims 44-47, 50, and 58

Claims 44-47 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Johnson and Gray. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Independent claim 44 recites, among other things, a processor for processing:

> a first hardware object, where the first hardware object:
> is accessible to the computer,

is depicted in the graphical interface, and
interacts with the hardware device;

a first configuration of the hardware device represented by the first hardware object, the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties;

a second hardware object, where the second hardware object:
is accessible to the computer,
is depicted in the graphical interface, and
interacts with the hardware device;

a second configuration of the hardware device represented by the second hardware object, the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration;

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson and Gray, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest at least *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*, which are present in claim 44.

As noted above, with respect to claim 30, Johnson and Gray, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest the above-quoted features of claim 44. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 45-47, 50, and 58 depend from independent claim 44 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 44. Accordingly claims 45-47, 50, and 58 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 44. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 45-47, 50, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

I.   **Claims 34, 35, and 38**

Claims 34, 35, and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Johnson, Gray, and Fuller. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 34, 35 and 38 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. As previously discussed, Johnson does not disclose or suggest providing first and second configurations, *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*. As further noted above with respect to claim 30, Gray also does not disclose or suggest these features of claim 30.

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest providing first and second configurations. Indeed, as noted above with respect to claim 7, Fuller is silent with respect to this feature of claim 30.

Thus Fuller, Gray, and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Fuller Gray, and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 34, 35 and 38.

J.   Claims 48, 49, and 52

Claims 48, 49 and 52 depend from claim 44 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson and Gray, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*, which is present in claim 44.

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Indeed, Fuller is silent with respect to this feature of claim 44.

Thus Fuller, Gray, and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Fuller, Gray, and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 48, 49 and 52.

K.   Claims 39, 40, 43, 53, and 54

Claims 39, 40, 43, 53, and 54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of Johnson, Gray, and Schmit. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 39, 40 and 43 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. Johnson and Gray do not disclose or suggest *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*, which are present in claim 30.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest these features. Indeed, as noted above with respect to claim 16, Schmit is silent with respect to these features of claim 30.

Thus Schmit, Gray, and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Schmit, Gray, and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 39, 40 and 43.

Claims 53 and 54 depend from claim 44 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson and Gray, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a*

property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration, which are present in claim 44.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Schmit is not concerned with allowing the objects to be accessible through an array-based environment. Accordingly, Schmit does not disclose *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*, as recited in claim 44.

Thus Schmit, Gray, and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Schmit, Gray, and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 53 and 54.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 39, 40, 43, 53, and 54.

L.   Claims 41, 42, and 55

Claims 41, 42, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over Johnson, Gray, and Pike. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 41 and 42 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. Johnson and Gray, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest providing a first and second configuration, *the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties*; and *the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration*, which are present in claim 30.

Pike also does not disclose or suggest these features. Pike describes communicating with a device in order to configure it. (Pike at [0027]). Pike describes that the user enters configuration data and then communicates back and forth with the device in order to change the configuration of the device itself. Pike does not describe first <u>and</u> second configurations, ***the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties***; and ***the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration***.

Thus Pike, Gray, and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Pike, Gray and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 41 and 42.

Claim 55 depends from claim 44 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson and Gray do not disclose or suggest ***the first configuration representing a collection of properties used to communicate with the hardware device and a first collection of values associated with the properties***; and ***the second configuration representing the same collection of properties as the first configuration and a second collection of values associated with the properties, wherein at least one value of a property differs between the first configuration and the second configuration***, which is present in claim 44.

Pike does not disclose or suggest this feature. Pike is silent as to multiple configurations. Thus Pike, Gray and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Pike, Gray and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 55.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-104RCE2. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: August 16, 2010   Respectfully submitted,

                                           Electronic signature: /Kevin J. Canning/
                                           Kevin J. Canning
                                           Registration No.: 35,470
                                           LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
                                           One Post Office Square
                                           Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127
                                           (617) 227-7400
                                           (617) 742-4214 (Fax)
                                           Attorney/Agent For Applicant

                                                -